CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to 571-273-8300, on March 31, 2006.

RAYMOND W. GREEN
Registered Representative

Signature

Date of Signature: March 31, 2006

PATENT
Case 285/502

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicants:	Daniel J. Mattson et al.	
Serial No.:	09/558,386	Confirmation No. 9739
Filed:	April 25, 2000	Group Art Unit: 2632
For:	SYSTEM FOR DETECTING AND RELEASING A PERSON LOCKED IN THE TRUNK OF A VEHICLE	Examiner: Davetta Woods Goins

VIA FACSIMILE – 571-273-8300
MAIL STOP AF
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RECORD OF INTERVIEW

On Thursday, March 30, 2006, a telephone interview was held between the Examiner, Davetta Goins, and the undersigned Attorney, Raymond W. Green, the courtesy of which is noted with appreciation. The call was initiated by the Examiner, but she was returning a phone call I had previously placed to her.

In the telephone message I left in the earlier call, I recounted that the Application was under Final Rejection, that we had had a telephone interview on or about February 17, 2006, and that at that time, the Examiner had asked for additional information on points of law. I explained that on March 9 (mailed March 6), I had filed a Request for Reconsideration of the outstanding Final Rejection mailed January 10, 2006; and that in the Request for Reconsideration, I had

attempted to provide all of the information that Examiner Goins had requested. I asked if the information had been reviewed, and whether it was sufficient – or whether additional information would be useful.

Examiner Goins responded that she had reviewed my submission, and that she had consulted with others in the USPTO who are familiar with the file; and that it appeared that we had provided sufficient information and arguments to overcome the Gager reference (U.S. Patent 6,222,442 B1) that is applied against the claims in each of the rejections of the Final Rejection of January 10, 2006. Examiner Goins explained that she intended to conduct yet another search for prior art to apply against the Application, and that unless she were able to find additional relevant art, she intended to allow the Application. Examiner Goins explained further that she intended to call me if she found additional art to be applied against the Application. (The Examiner is reminded that my direct telephone number is 312-321-4222.)

I asked Examiner Goins if she meant formal allowance or a notice of allowability, subject to an interference with the Miller Patent (U.S. Patent 6,130,614). Examiner Goins explained that she had meant a notice of allowability, subject to a possible interference with the Miller Patent, which is now undergoing reexamination, and is waiting for a decision on appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

Examiner Goins asked if we intended to file a Notice of Appeal when it was due, regardless of whether we had received a further communication regarding the Application. I responded "No", we did not intend to file a Notice of Appeal unless this is necessary.

The Examiner is reminded that a Notice of Appeal is currently due ***April 10, 2006***. Although Applicants filed a first response to the Final Action within 2 months of the mailing date of the Action, in accordance with the procedure described in Section 7 at page 25 of the Action, Applicants would prefer not to request *any* further extension of time (particularly not an extension of time because of delay by the USPTO in formally responding to Applicants' Request for Reconsideration) in this Application, which has now been pending almost ***six years*** (or seven, if the pendency of the provisional application is counted), without yet being involved in the requested interference with the Miller Patent. Likewise, Applicants would prefer not to need to file a Notice of Appeal with respect to rejections that Examiner Goins now admits should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the Examiner is urged to conduct such further examination, searching and investigation as may be necessary, in time to either issue a notice of allowability, subject to an interference with the Miller Patent, or to further reject the Application, ***prior to April 10, 2006***. In the event that the Examiner is unable to either allow or reject by April 10, the Examiner is urged to vacate the Final Rejection, so as to make an inappropriate appeal unnecessary, as requested at page 3 of the Request for Reconsideration filed March 9, 2006 ("In the event that the Examiner cannot see clear to allow the Application at this time, due to the continued existence of Miller U.S. Patent 6,130,614, withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action of January 10, 2006; withdrawal of the rejections based on Gager U.S. Patent 6,222,442 B1; and suspension of prosecution in this Application, pending the resolution of the current appeal of the rejection of all surviving claims of the Miller Patent, would appear to be appropriate.").

The outstanding rejections should be withdrawn, and the Application indicated to be allowable. Such action is courteously requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Raymond W. Green
Registration No. 24,587

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P. O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
312-321-4222

March 31, 2006